



Extraordinary Scrutiny Committee

12:30 to 14:50

12 November 2021

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Carlo, Driver, Galvin, Giles, Haynes (Substitute for Councillor Osborn), Maxwell (substitute for Councillor Matthew Fulton-McAlister), Sands (M) (substitute for Councillor Manning) Stutely, Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

Apologies: Councillors Fulton-McAlister (M), Manning and Osborn.

Also present: Councillor Price

1. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Health, safety and compliance in council homes

The chair reminded members that any questions on the exempt appendix would be taken under that part of the meeting. The chair welcomed officers and Councillor Price as chair of the audit committee.

The executive director of community services presented the report. The report set out the council's position in relation to health safety and compliance, the findings of the housing regulator in relation to compliance and the plans in place to return the council to a position of full compliance. Sharon Page, communications manager, Vivian Knibbs, interim director of housing operations and David Gleeson, asset consultant were all introduced.

The chair asked for clarification on paragraph 9 of the report around the ownership of the companies. The executive director of community service said that the paragraph was correct and outlined the ownership of the companies. A second paragraph highlighted by the chair referred to contractual arrangements which were high level descriptions of responsibilities and service level agreements sitting below these.

A member said that it was important that the committee scrutinised this topic and that she had already asked for in depth scrutiny of the subject. The chair said that at its next scheduled meeting, the committee would discuss the work programme and the current discussion would inform a scope for piece of further scrutiny work. Councillor

Waters commented that the monitoring and progress of the compliance work built this in with a number of governance arrangements to report to cabinet. The scrutiny committee set its own work programme and may wish to have those cabinet reports coming to scrutiny.

In response to a question from a member, the chair confirmed that he had received a request from the leader of the council that the scrutiny committee would consider the report, and also a topic form on the subject from Councillor Galvin, and had worked with officers in the usual way to pick an appropriate date for the meeting.

The executive director of community services was invited to outline the report. She confirmed that following her appointment in April 2021, alongside a review of corporate governance initiated by the Chief Executive, she asked asset consultants to undertake a high level review of compliance management in council homes. She wanted a clear understanding of how the council was meeting its responsibilities in this area. The initial finding raised concerns around electrical and fire safety inspections. A series of meetings were held with NPS Norwich to get a baseline position and to identify actions that were needed which were prioritised on a risk basis. In July 2021, the council made the decision to self-refer to the Housing Regulator to consider whether it was in breach of the home standard. The consultants findings were concluded in October and a high level overview of these findings were included in the report. A health and safety compliance board had been established to oversee the compliance plan and the Housing Regulator had the level of assurance it needed to not take any further action against the council based on the plans submitted so far.

A member commented that the risk register at page 20 of the report started to lay out the most critical risks but the timescales for producing a full risk register were missing. The executive director of community services said that the project risk register was under development and it was anticipated that this would be ready as part of the December report to the Housing Regulator.

A member said that the council had taken responsibility and apologised to leaseholders but asked whether the council had done enough. The deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing said that once the issues had been found, she supported the executive director of community services in the decision to self-refer to the Housing Regulator. The council had taken great care in communicating with tenants and leaseholders in a number of ways with letters sent to each of them setting out the situation with contact details if they had any concerns and information in the TLC tenants magazine and on the council's website. There would be investment in computer systems and committed staff and senior officer driving improvements forward. Communication would be paramount throughout the process.

A member asked if the executive director of community services could explain more about the compliance board. She said that she was chair of the board and it was attended by the portfolio holder for housing and for resources, alongside the Chief Executive and the executive director of development and city services with other senior colleagues, such as the council's monitoring officer. The board would meet monthly to prepare a report for the regulator whilst providing the leadership to drive the plan forward with the right resources.

By way of a follow up question the chair asked how tenants and leaseholders would be involved in the improvement journey as they were not represented on the board. The deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing said that there was already a tenants improvement panel which met in its own right, that she attended. The executive director of community services said that she would also attend the next meeting to give an update and then would attend regularly throughout the process.

A member commented that the report showed the way forward but there was no information showing the responsibility for writing and checking contracts and checking that work had been carried out. She endorsed the suggestion of further scrutiny work as members needed to understand the context of the issues. The chief executive identified that he had placed emphasis on good governance across the council, including around major contracts. A new leadership team had been recruited and heads of services were reviewing contracts within their areas. Shareholder panels had been set up to oversee NRL and NCSL and heads of service were having regular meetings with the managing directors of those companies. A corporate health and safety board had also been set up to look at issues across the council with further training on contract management to ensure there was clarity across the organisation. He hoped that these points gave assurance as to the weight placed on the issue to health and safety.

The leader of the council said that a range of issues had already been addressed and the structures that the chief executive had outlined would provide the information needed. There would be regular reporting on the progress to ensure that the council had the resources it needed to reach 100% compliance within the timeframe set out in the report. There was a need to separate the safety of tenants from a historical exercise which would detract resources from the forward thinking work that needed to be done.

A member asked how the council would be working with the regulator to maintain compliance. The executive director of community services said that as soon as the council was aware of the issues, it self-referred so it was recognised that at that point, it did not have the full picture. The council was working with the regulator as details emerged and was setting out a plan for improvement. There would be monthly meetings with the regulator until 100% compliance had been achieved.

In response to a member's question, the executive director of community services said that with regards to the cost of the compliance the funding would need to be available over a specific time period. There would inevitably be additional costs due to the timescales involved. It was a high priority piece of work so other works may need to be paused but this would be dependent on staff and contractor availability. The asset consultant said that the certifications for the works would all be recorded digitally and would include remedial works against each property.

A member questioned how works were completed where a tenant refused entry. The interim housing operation director said that there was a well developed process to gain access with a contractor making three attempts and where those attempts failed, the case was passed to the housing management team who would attempt to contact the tenant. Where the inspection related to gas, the council could seek to obtain a warrant which was due procedure under legislation. Electrical testing used different legislation and in those cases, if the housing management team had been unsuccessful, they

would work with nplaw to secure an injunction to gain access to the property. However, the council would rather not take legal action if possible. The deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing said that housing officers would always try to work with the individual tenants rather than taking legal action which would be a last resort.

A member commented that £2million was a lot of money and there were a raft of safety issues to mitigate. She referenced that she was aware of an LGSS audit report which stated that there was a lack of robust contract management. She asked how the council could be sure of good governance going forward and why no one was aware of those issues. The executive director of community services said that the report set out the high level findings and a contract was in place between the council and NPSN. Some of the terms of that contract were not as clear as they should be but ultimately, the council was responsible for the health and safety of its homes. The report was clear about what was wrong and what was needed to put it right. The recommendations built in resources to get the work right over the stated timeframe. The executive director of development and city services said that the council had recognised that there was a need for more expertise and this was being sought.

A member asked why no one was aware of the issues prior to the appointment of the executive director of community services and asked whether all areas of the directorate were spot checked. Tenants could have been involved at an earlier point with an emergency meeting. The member felt some formalised tenant involvement on the health and safety compliance board and also oversight from councillors not on the cabinet would ensure transparency and rebuild trust. The executive director of community services identified that there were teams of very dedicated people in the housing service who were doing difficult work. There were some areas of the service that were performing highly and some that with support and changes around IT could see improvement. Her housing background meant the first thing she wanted to check was that compliance and health and safety management was in place and that she could be confident in how it was being dealt with.

The leader of the council said that the administration owned the issues and the responsibility to make them right. There would be regular cabinet reports on compliance which would be available to all members which included the scrutiny committee if it wished to add them to its work program. Opposition representatives were always invited to cabinet and were able to ask questions on reports. The robustness of scrutiny was already well embedded into the system and it was an important function of the council to hold the administration to account and also to understand the progress being made.

The executive director of community service said that before speaking to tenants and leaseholders, the council needed to establish a clear position. The leader and deputy leader of the council were aware of the issues straight away and were consulted on the referral to the regulator. There had been discussions with cabinet members in the late summer about emerging issues and then the information was cascaded.

The chair invited the chair of the audit committee to make a statement and said that members of the scrutiny committee could seek clarification on points he had made.

The chair of audit said that it was good to see the work being done between scrutiny and audit committees and to see the senior leadership team working in new and progressive ways on the issues.

The audit committee had considered a proposal in the 2017-18 internal audit report to postpone the review of the NPS contract as it was told that there was assurance that it would be considered in the next round of contract management. In March 2018, the draft audit plan looked at commissioning and contract management which included contracts for refuse, repairs and maintenance, NPS and waste management so these were being considered as important contracts to review. The 2019-20 annual report showed a lack of robust management in housing contracts due to limited assurance being received. He had concerns around contract management with issues that did not seem to be being picked up until there was intervention from audit and he felt there needed to be more work to provide assurance on contract management. He acknowledged that issues had been identified and were systematically addressed through the senior leadership team looking at areas of risk and said that the audit committee was acting as a critical friend. There had been an abundance of evidence that there were unsatisfactory contracts and there was a need to go back historically and identify any risks and costs arising from these. Changes needed to be implemented and then the fundamental issue of contract management needed to be addressed to establish liabilities.

The chair asked if there needed to be an increased resource in internal audit. The Chair of audit said that the senior leadership team was looking to address underlying issues so it may not be necessary at the moment but ultimately, an additional resource may be beneficial.

The leader of the council said that the first priority was to resolve the compliance issues which was the narrative of the meeting. A decision had been taken in 2017 to bring the joint ventures to an end which was a recognition that the council would be able to undertake that work itself. The work would be informed by a more robust set of governance structures and would be looking at compliance and contract management issues to ensure that council owned companies were performing as expected.

The chief executive said that internal audit was seen as a tool to improve the council and it was helpful that the chair of audit had acknowledged the change of emphasis. Measures had been put in place to improve the capacity and the capability of internal audit and it had always been the intention that the new executive directors would identify gaps in capacity in services. The Covid-19 Recovery Plan showed that services would be reviewed due to changes in expectations and behaviours.

A member asked the chair of audit if he thought that there should be an internal audit investigation into the contract to show where responsibility would lie for contract management. The chair of audit said that since the audit committee had started to look at contract management and had identified issues, he had consistently said that contracts should be looked at retrospectively to fully understand the risk. The work would need to be undertaken by the scrutiny committee and audit committee could be used as a tool for this.

In response to a member's question on how the other areas of the housing service were working, the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing said that there were many aspects of the service working very well such as the rough sleeping team, the work being done with registered partners and the sheltered housing officers who worked closely with tenants.

A member asked what feedback had come from the letters sent to tenants and how would actions to resolve compliance issues be signed off and assessed. The deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing said that as many information channels as possible had been set up. Staff were available on phone lines for the first weekend. Less than one hundred contacts had been made, not all of which were about the compliance issues, which showed that recipients had been reassured. The executive director of community services added that housing officers and NPS staff would assess the actions and the board would have oversight of the programme and its delivery.

In response to a question on training, the chair of audit said that there was a need for training and improving skills was fundamental for councillors. There was also a need to ensure that policies were fit for purpose and being implemented. A member added that it would be useful if members could receive training on functions such as audit, scrutiny, contract management and Key Performance Indicators. She would also welcome regular briefings on housing. The executive director of community services said that regular briefings were held with opposition councillors with community services. The first briefing specifically on housing had already been scheduled.

A member asked if officers could elaborate on how having direct control of the services being brought back in house could help to achieve compliance. The executive director of community services said that the council would have greater control over the services and would also have direct oversight of governance and performance management.

3. Exclusion of the public

RESOLVED to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of item *4 (below) on the grounds contained in the relevant paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

***4. Health, safety and compliance in council homes – exempt appendix (para 3)**

(An exempt minute exists for this item.)

RESOLVED, to note the exempt appendix.

(Members of the public were readmitted to the meeting).

4. Health, safety and compliance in council homes

A resolution was moved to ask cabinet to support scrutiny committee to undertake a review of exactly what happened with regards to health, safety and compliance in

council homes. With seven members voting against and two in favour, the motion was lost.

A resolution was moved to allow opposition councillors to sit on the Health and Safety Compliance Board. With seven members voting against and two in favour, the motion as lost.

RESOLVED, unanimously:

- 1) For the chair of the committee and the Executive Director to determine a mechanism to inform the scrutiny committee of progress with regards the matters referred to in the exempt paper;
- 2) That a report comes to scrutiny committee in early summer on the progress in delivering services referred to in the report following the transfer to NCS Ltd;
- 3) That the Housing Compliance Board regularly updates the Tenant Improvement Panel on its progress in securing compliance with required housing standards
- 4) That cabinet considers how compliance and safety risks are reflected in the council's risk register; and
- 5) The provision of training to councillors on contract management, compliance and performance management is reviewed

CHAIR



Scrutiny Committee

16:30 to 18:30

18 November 2021

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Carlo, Driver, Everett, Galvin, Giles, Haynes (Substitute for Councillor Osborn), Maxwell (substitute for Councillor Matthew Fulton-McAlister), Sands (M) (substitute for Councillor Manning) Stutely, Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

Apologies: Councillors Fulton-McAlister, Manning and Huntley

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Driver declared an other interest in item 4 below as a council tenant.

Councillor Vaughan Thomas declared an other interest in item 4 below as a welfare rights officer working in the advice industry.

2. Minutes

Subject to the following corrections to item 5:

- To amend the first sentence of the fourth paragraph to read “The fuel poverty and energy officer referred to the report taken to CEEEP on retro-fitting energy efficient appliances in council properties and the initiatives being taken by the council.”
- Remove the words “into said that” at the beginning of the following sentence
- Remove ‘be’ before ‘become’ in the same sentence.
- For clarity, amend the second sentence of the fifth paragraph to read “Regarding airport expansion, the chair speculated that the airport’s plans could be reviewed in light of the impact on travel of the pandemic.”
- Amending resolution 6 to read “recommend that when the BEIS per capita figures are reported in council reports that it is stated that the BEIS data set does not include production, consumption, shipping and aviation.”

It was **RESOLVED** to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2021.

3. NHOSC update

The representative gave a verbal update. The committee had discussed eating disorders with a particular focus on young people. He had asked about acute hospital facilities supporting young people subjected to additional trauma due to tube feeding and heard that numbers receiving this treatment were low although overall numbers of those with eating disorders had increased.

There had been discussion on the closure of the mental health facilities at Hellesdon Hospital which were due to reopen in December. A decision on making the facility women only had not yet been taken.

With regards to housing, there had been a suggestion that district councils were responsible for the high numbers of patients in beds when they were fit enough for discharge. The representative had highlighted the pressure on Norwich City Council for housing and would report back to NHSOC on those pressures.

The committee had also heard a report on a review of safeguarding at Cawston Park Hospital.

Any further questions for NHOSC could be directed to Councillor Stutely, the representative on NHOSC.

A member asked if there was any work being done to follow up on eating disorders in over 18 year olds as there were issues with the system when patients transitioned from under to over 18. The representative said that eating disorders amongst all age groups were discussed and he would forward some data around this.

A member commented that an item had been taken to the September meeting of NHOSC on vulnerable adults primary care service and she had a number of questions about this. The representative said to forward any questions to him directly.

RESOLVED to note the update of the council's representative on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

4. The emerging new social inclusion agenda following Covid-19

The chair welcomed officers and the leader of the council in the absence of the portfolio holder, Councillor Karen Davis, who sent her apologies due to needing to self-isolate.

The strategy manager presented the report. It set out the council's approach to reducing inequalities in a number of areas and identified lessons learnt from the early stages of the pandemic. There had been locality based work undertaken where the greatest disadvantages had been identified in areas such as food and fuel poverty, digital inclusion and diversity and equality.

The paper showed that Covid-19 had the worst effects on those already facing significant disadvantage. The council had been able to move quickly on work around this due to strong partnerships and this would be built on using the existing reducing inequalities action plan.

The chair commented that the Living Wage was very important to help with reducing inequalities and invited the leader of the council to give an overview of the work being done around the Living Wage in the context of social inclusion.

The leader of the council said that the Living Wage foundation had launched that week. There was an ethical responsibility to have a well supported workforce with good working conditions. An additional thirteen businesses had joined the Living Wage network in 2021 which was uplifting in light of challenges such as Covid-19, zero hours contracts and the transition to a low carbon society. There was a three year programme put in place to establish Norwich as a Living Wage city.

A member asked if there was any data to indicate that those in receipt of the living wage were still using mechanisms such as food banks or several jobs and added if there would be any assurances that those areas in receipt of additional resources for pilot schemes would remain in place. The leader of the council said that part of the Living Wage Foundation Strategy was looking into 'living hours' and pension schemes as those that worked less hours would still be at a disadvantage.

The neighbourhood and community enabling manager added that the pilot scheme in the Lakenham area was based on a finite amount of funding but opportunities for more funding were always being sought. Resilience within communities needed to be built into the work to create structures that could use additional grant funding and those resources would be deployed wherever it was most appropriate within those areas.

A member asked if there were figures available on how many employers that were Living Wage accredited were paying low wages before the accreditation or were businesses that were already paying significantly above the living wage. The leader of the council said that within the profiles of the workforce of those accredited businesses there would always be staff who were in receipt of wages above the Living Wage but would also have lower paid staff who would benefit from the accreditation. There was also a requirement that all those who were directly employed had to be paid the Living Wage so it was a significant piece of work for companies to ensure all of their roles were compliant. The additional employers joining the scheme meant that around 8,000 employees would benefit.

A member referred to the overlap in areas regarding Reducing Inequalities Target Areas (RITA) and asked if there was a way to give a very focussed local approach to an area. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that the council was looking at how best to capture conversations within the community with council staff, such as housing officers, and share that information across services areas. Internally, there was a reducing inequalities group which made the most of those connections to understand how services could work together.

A member highlighted that the heat map in the report showed that the RITAs were sometimes not in direct correlation to need and asked what the long term strategy was

on those initiatives and the process for the council to listen to the community and measure how these had worked alongside records of how the money had been spent to achieve those outcomes. The senior strategy officer said that in order to define the areas for a RITA, there was an extensive exercise with partners using outcome data to pinpoint wards and then streets that were the most disadvantaged. The maps within the agenda pack were developed to test whether the areas identified post lockdown were still the most appropriate and broadly the initial areas identified were felt to be still the key areas of need that the work would focus on. In the long term, the approach would be to bring in resources in those areas by working together with partners and looking at what a shared outcome framework might look like. The framework would be a tool to understand community issues and identify partner outcomes and individual projects would take community views into consideration.

In response to a member's question on the council's legal ability to consider not using companies which employed people on zero hours contracts, the council's monitoring officer said that she would need to look into the issue and come back to the member outside of the meeting.

A member asked if those inequalities identified were getting better or worse with interventions. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that there were always challenges around quantifying inequalities and the council did not want to overburden individuals with evaluation. There was a need to understand what the council had control over and what could be measured with pilot work. Individual projects could have specific outcome goals but wider projects may not see change for a generation so where data could be collected more frequently to show correlations it would be although it was a difficult and delicate process. The senior strategy officer added that where approaches to issues had worked for partners, these could be replicated by the council.

A member commented that there was a divide between the public and private sector with the private sector making donations to projects but still producing problems, such as having low paid staff who still needed to make use of food banks. Those people living within Norwich were often on lower wages than those that came into the city to work so there was work needed to integrate with the private sector. The strategy manager said that the Good Economy Commission and the City Vision Partnership would be an important part of that work along with the Living Wage group to get all institutions working together. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager added that part of the CRF bid was working with businesses in the community to understand how they could contribute to that work.

(The leader of the council left the meeting at this point).

A member referred to the maps showing areas of deprivation and asked if there was any work being done around unemployment and the wait for benefits which would have a knock-on effect around deprivation. The financial inclusion liaison officer commented that the council's hands were tied regarding Universal Credit legislation but it did have a Council Tax Reduction Scheme which helps to mitigate the impact of Universal Credit legislation. There had also been work done around debt and early intervention to get support for people as soon as possible and to make referrals quickly. There were weekly meetings with multiple service areas to discuss solutions

for those needing additional support but there was no quick fix. Out of the sixteen Living Wage employers, nine of those were private sector businesses so progress was being made. There was also learning from other cities which had been through the Living Wage City process and a robust three year plan was being formulated.

In response to a question on citizen participation, the neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that there had been a lot of research undertaken to understand the key principles and methodologies and engagement work had been done with community groups. The next phase of work would be take those principles and look at actions to be worked on against them. There was a need to understand how to get residents to talk to the council and to show that they would see change as a result of their participation. There was a pilot scheme for a community connector role which employed local people from a particular area on a living wage and four appointments had been made to those roles so far. The council wanted to listen to and act upon feedback from local communities. The member commented that residents sometimes felt that they did not get feedback from the council or a satisfactory response to queries which impacted on trust in the council, so a wider look at how the council communicated with residents would be welcome which could include making the language of communications from the council as accessible as possible and making it clear who residents needed to contact for advice and solutions to issues. The executive director of community services said that this would be a very large piece of work but there was an awareness that work needed to be undertaken on communications with tenants. The member offered to feed in examples of improvement which may help.

(At this point in the meeting, members took a five minute adjournment and resumed at 18:10)

Members discussed the concept of social supermarkets and the value they brought to local communities. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that these were identified as a useful resource as part of the Food Poverty Action Plan. There was a social supermarket already planned in the city which had utilised the community asset transfer model with a local café and The Feed had been successful in its bid to run the café element. People could visit to use the café or to get subsidised fruit and vegetables so there was no stigma in visiting. It was linked to the community hub model and there were plans to look at the holistic needs of those who would visit the supermarket so that appropriate referrals could also be made. There were also potential plans to fund workshops and training programmes around cooking.

A member asked if there was a timetable for opening the social supermarket and funding for staffing. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager answered that the process for agreeing licenses for The Feed had started and it was hoped that the venue would be open in the new year. A staff member was already in place and The Feed had external funding for that position.

It was **RESOLVED** to

1) ask cabinet to:

- a) ask cabinet to commission a background report on inequality in Norwich with benchmarking from other cities and long term trends to inform an evidence

based framework which would set and link to existing Key Performance Indicators (not to be to the detriment of on the ground work)

- b) consider whether it is legally viable to begin establishing a matrix in accordance with procurement strategy which also includes trade union recognition, lack of use of zero hours contract and broadly comparable gender pay gap with the council
 - c) ensure that appropriate resources are available to ensure that the good work on social inclusion projects continues
 - d) resource staffing to seek new venues and funding for social supermarkets across the city and to increase provision and extend existing projects.
 - e) Engage with communities to ensure participatory budgeting processes.
 - f) ensure digital inclusion work continues and is extended where possible.
- 2) ask for the topic of ward breakdown of project delivery to be considered by the scrutiny committee in the new civic year and
- 3) To receive an update on work being done to improve communications with tenants.
- 4) To note that the scrutiny committee recognises the link between inequality and education and would like to consider this as a piece of future scrutiny work, to include how the council works with partners on this issue.

5. Scrutiny committee work programme 2021-22

The chair presented the report.

The meeting scheduled for 2 December 2021 to consider the business plans for NRL and NCSL would instead take place on 10 or 11 January 2022 and would be a remote meeting.

The topic for the meeting on 16 December was designated to consider the Corporate Plan but as this was a full review and not an annual refresh, it would be considered at the meeting on 20 January 2022. Instead, the committee would consider the Equality Information report.

The item on a sustainable and inclusive Norwich economy following Covid-19 would move to the meeting on 17 March 2022.

A member commented that she had submitted a TOPIC form on health and safety compliance in council homes to ask for the compliance issues and contract management to be considered by the scrutiny committee as a substantial amount of information around this topic had not been discussed at meetings of scrutiny and cabinet on 12 November 2021. There was an urgent need to look at the processes

around contract management and what went wrong to ensure that it did not happen again.

The chair referred to the meetings held on 12 November and said that the request for the issue to be looked at by the scrutiny committee had been reflected in the minutes of that meeting. At the meeting of the scrutiny committee, members voted against a recommendation to consider a piece of work reviewing what went wrong to ensure that resources were used to implement the compliance plans. The member said that she wanted to bring the issue to the scrutiny committee again as she did not feel that it was looked at in enough detail.

The councils monitoring officer referred to the constitution and highlighted that a motion that had already been decided within the last six months could not be considered and the request to add the topic to the scrutiny work programme was substantially similar to one considered on 12 November 2021 by the scrutiny committee which had been defeated. The procedure rules were written with full council in mind but did apply to other committees.

The chair added that the scrutiny committee would be looking at various elements of housing safety compliance in the future so although this particular request had been defeated, there were other resolution passed which meant that the topic would be considered. Processes within the constitution had been followed and the committee had spent considerable time at the meeting on 12 November 2021 dealing with its concerns.

The monitoring officer added that a resolution had been passed at that meeting to look at progress around compliance and the details of the scope of that piece of work would be considered nearer the time by the committee. Members commented that resource should be prioritised immediately to fix the issues but there would be opportunities in the future to review the topic in detail.

RESOLVED to note that:

- 1) the meeting to consider the NRL and NCSL business plans would take place on 10 or 11 January 2022
- 2) the meeting on 16 December 2021 would consider the Equality Information report
- 3) the Corporate Plan would be considered at the meeting on 20 January 2022; and
- 4) the item on a sustainable and inclusive Norwich economy following Covid-19 would move to the meeting on 17 March 2022.

CHAIR